

Application Serial No. 10/581,951  
Reply to Office Action of June 10, 2009

PATENT  
Docket: CU-4849

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated June 10, 2009, the Examiner states that Claims 1-3 are pending and Claims 1-3 are rejected. By the present Amendment, the Applicant amends the claims. The Applicant submits that the rejections are overcome by amendment or are traversed by argument below.

In the Claims, please amend claims 1-3. The claims have been amended to be directed only to gaseous samples. The amendment is supported in the original disclosure, for instance in paragraphs [0015] and [0018], and therefore, no new matter has been added. The amendments to the claims can be viewed in the Amendments section of this paper in the Listing of Claims beginning on page 2.

### Rejection of Claims 1- 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Examiner asserted an obviousness rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Abdel-Rehim in view of Cronin (U.S. 5,064,418). Claim 3 is also rejected as unpatentable over Abdel-Rehim in view of Cronin and further in view of JP 10-10104 (Takii et al.); and also over Abdel-Rehim in view of Cronin and further in view of Reinhardt et al.

For the sake of furthering prosecution, the Applicant has amended to claims to limit the samples to gaseous samples. Adbel-Rehim is directed to solid phase microextraction (SPME) of liquid samples and clearly excludes gaseous samples (see for instance, claims 1 and 5). Cronin is silent as to gaseous samples, and in fact, Cronin is not related to an SPME device anyway, and therefore, is not even relevant. Neither Takii et al., nor Reinhardt et al. cure the deficit found in Adbel-Rehim.

The Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that claims 1-3, involving gaseous samples, are non-obvious and allowable because all of the elements of these claims is not taught, disclosed, or suggested by the references, in whole or in combination. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection as to the claims.

Application Serial No. 10/581,951  
Reply to Office Action of June 10, 2009

PATENT  
Docket: CU-4849

### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

8-31-09

Date



Attorney for Applicant  
Zareefa B. Flener  
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
Reg. No. 52,896